

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HERMAN TAMRAT,
Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM KAUFMAN,
Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-01324-PJH

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
WITHDRAW AS ATTORNEY AND
LIFTING STAY**

Re: Dkt. No. 102, 103

Appointed pro bono counsel in this case have filed a motion to withdraw as counsel for plaintiff. See Dkt. 102. The motion includes a declaration from counsel stating that there are sufficient grounds for mandatory withdrawal under California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(a), and that a more specific description of the reason for withdrawal would involve disclosure of attorney-client communications. See id. at 6. The declaration also states that counsel consulted with staff from the Federal Pro Bono Project before filing the motion. Id.

The court issued an order providing plaintiff with an opportunity to file a response to counsel's motion. See Dkt. 103. The docket in this case shows that plaintiff was served with a copy of counsel's motion, and with a copy of the court's order setting an October 31, 2022 deadline for plaintiff to file a response. See Dkt. 102-2; Dkt. 104. That deadline has now passed, and plaintiff has not filed any opposition or other response to counsel's motion. Accordingly, appointed pro bono counsel's unopposed motion to withdraw (Dkt. 102) is GRANTED, and plaintiff shall proceed with his claims in pro per. In light of the withdrawal, counsel's earlier-filed motion to compel confidential videoconferences between counsel and client (Dkt. 93) is denied as moot.

Finally, because this case was stayed to allow counsel to familiarize themselves with the case, the stay is no longer necessary in light of counsel's withdrawal, and thus

the stay is LIFTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 29, 2022

/s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California